1946. **K** **File No.** B.L.A. Bel/46

Examine d

Legal DEPARTMENT

C BRANCH P.46(E)/1946

Subject:— Bill for R.L A's Countersignature from D. G. P. P. P and his Assistants Belgaum District in land acquisition cases.

File No. B.L.A. Belgaum/47/46

Std. Sectt. Slip 24-B

507-#C

Contents.

Legal Department.

Volume. B.L.A. Bel./46.

S. No.	Compiliation No.	Subject.	Pages.
	B.L.A. Bel./46.	Bill for R.L.A.'s Countersignature from D.G.P. P.P. and his Assistants Belgaum Distt. in Land Acquisition cases.	
1.	J 78/1945 24-7-1945. RF 6317 26-7-45	Letter from D.G.P. Belgaum Re: Land Acquisition Suit No. 3/1944 (Dhupdal Stage and Reservior.	1-45
2	G.M.L.D 1398 11-2-47	Law charges - Payment of to the Ex.D.G.P. Belgaum in LAQ Suit No. 3/1944 on the file of D. J. Belgaum.	47

3/1/47

Contents.

Legal Department.

Volume. B.L.A. Bel./46.

No.	Compiliation No.	Subject.	Pages.
	B.L.A. Bel./46.	Bill for R.L.A.'s Countersignature from D.G.P. P.P. and his Assistants Belgaum Distt. in Land Acquisition cases.	
1.	J 78/1945 24-7-1945. R.I. 6317 26-7-45	A letter from D.G.P. Belgaum Re: Land Acquisition Suit No. 3/1944 (Dhupdal Stage and Reservior.	1-45
2	G.M.L.D 1378 11-2-47	Law charges - Payment of to the Ex.D.G.P. Belgaum in LAQ Suit No. 3/1944 on the file of D. J. Belgaum.	47

28/1/25

Contents.

Legal Department.

Volume. B.L.A. Bel./46.

S. No.	Compiliation No.	Subject.	Pages.
	B.L.A. Bel./46.	Bill for R.L.A.'s Countersignature from D.G.P. P.P. and his Assistants Belgaum Distt. in Land Acquisition cases.	
1.	J 78/1945 24-7-1945. R.T. 6317 26.7.45	A letter from D.G.P. Belgaum Re: Land Acquisition Suit No. 3/1944 (Dhupdal Stage and Reservior.	1-45
2	G M L D 1398 11-2-47	Law charges - Payment of to the Ex.D.G.P. Belgaum in LAQ Suit No. 3/1944 on the file of D. J. Belgaum.	47

3/1/15

No.J- 78 of 1945.
Belgaum, 24th July 1945.

To

The Remembrancer of Legal Affairs,
BOMBAY.

SIR,

I have the honour to submit herewith my bills of fees and expenses in connection with Land Acquisition Suit No. 3 of 1944, on the file of the District Judge, Belgaum, and to reques you to be good enough to return the same duly countersigned at an early date. A copy of decree with bill of costs is enclosed herewith for favour of perusal.

Your obedient servant,

V. A. [illegible]

District Government Pleader,
Belgaum.

6317
Dt. 26-7-45
Branch C

No.L.A.Q.Suit 3/1944.
Belgaum,10th August 1945.

To

The Remembrancer of Legal Affairs,Bombay.

Subject:-Land Acquisition Suit No.3/1944.
(Dhupdal Storage Reservior).

Sir,

With reference to your No. 5662 dated the 31st July 1945, returning the Bills in the above-mention-ed L.A.Q.Suit, requesting to remove the objections, raised on it, I have the honour to state as under:-

Objection No.7:- The necessary number & date of the Gazette notification and the purpose for which the land was acquired is stated.

Objection No.8:- The correct classification is given.

Objection No.31:- The necessary information as regards is given in para 2 of the judgment in the case. It is thus: "Collector awarded Rs.1682-8-0, plus Rs.292-8-0 in shape of mesne profits, since

1925 at Rs.10/- per acre. Applicants claimed in all Rs.4881/- and deducting therefrom, the amount already received they claim Rs. 3198/-. "

Your obedient servant,

V. M. [illegible]

Dist.Govt.Pleader, Belgaum.

1668-2

1682-8
292-8
1975

3198
1975
5173

4881
1975
2906

5 Legal Department (CO)
7036 / 15.8.1945

Submitted with pp.

2. The District Government Pleader, Belgaum, had submitted two bills for Rs. 135/15/- and Rs. 38/15/- for fees and law charges in Land Acquisition Suit No. 3 of 1944. The bills were returned with objections nos. 7, 8 and 31 for compliance. The D. G. P. has duly complied with objn. no. 7 by entering in the body of the bill the number and date of the Gazette notfn. under which land was acquired. As regards objn. no. 8, the D. G. P. has given certain classification. As a matter of fact the D. G. P. should not have stated any classification on the bill. However if the classification is correct it will be retained, if wrong, it will be struck out and the correct ~~correct~~ classification will be put.

3. By objn. no 31, the D G. P. was asked to state the amount of compensation awarded by the Collector and the amount of compensation claimed in the Reference to

16 the Court. In reply the D.G.P. states that the Collector awarded Rs. 1975. The applicants claimed Rs. 3198-0

1682-8
+ 292-8
1975-0

4. Please see the provisions of rule 21(4)(a) of the L.O.(C.O.S.) Rules. Accordingly the D.G.P. will be entitled to the fees calculated on the difference between the amount of compensation awarded by the Collector and the amount of compensation claimed in the Reference to the Court. as shown in the margin

3198-0
1975-0
1223-0

100 : 1225 ::
49
1225 × 5 =
4

= 61-4-0

5 The bills may therefore be returned to the District Govt. Plender, Belgaum, with objn. no. 31 for compliance.

+ slip F.

Bgm. 5/9/45

It has been noticed that the D.G.P. Belgaum has been countersigning the bills himself. He may therefore be informed that he should not do so

Supt. 7/9 in the future.

P.A. 7/9

G.O.P.—(J) H 336—3000—7-38—P2*
G.R., L.D., No. 165 dated 24-1-23

[Spl.—Sectt. (L. D.) 3

OBJECTION MEMORANDUM

No. 6744

OFFICE OF THE
REMEMBRANCER OF LEGAL AFFAIRS :

Bombay Castle, 14th September 1945.

MEMORANDUM

Bills for Rs. 135/15/- and Rs. 38/15/-

The bills / noted in the margin ~~is~~ are with accompaniments returned to the

~~District~~ / ~~Assistant~~ / ~~Subordinate~~ Government Pleader, Belgaum

with a request that Objections Nos 31 to 32 below stated may be complied with.

To
The District Government Pleader,
Belgaum.

By order,

13/9

Superintendent,
for Remembrancer of Legal Affairs.

13/9/45

Issued No. 1819

NATURE OF OBJECTIONS.

1. In Civil cases a separate bill in each case should be submitted under rule 181 of the Law Officers' Rules (*i*) under "Allowances" for fees including travelling allowance and (*ii*) under "Contingencies", i.e. for law charges inclusive of copying and miscellaneous expenses.
2. In Criminal cases one-monthly separate bill should be preferred direct to the treasury under rule 179 of the Law Officers' Rules (*i*) under "Allowances" for fees including travelling allowance and (*ii*) under "Contingencies", i.e. for law charges inclusive of copying and miscellaneous expenses.
3. In criminal cases when bills are not submitted to the Treasury within six months, they should be submitted for special sanction of the Remembrancer of Legal Affairs with reasons for the delay [*vide* rule 179 (3) of the Law Officers' Rules].
4. In criminal cases when vouchers are not available, the Travelling Allowance bills should be submitted for certificate of the Remembrancer of Legal Affairs with reasons for non-submission of vouchers, *vide* Remembrancer of Legal Affairs' Circular No. 8905, dated the 15th December 1931.
5. In criminal or civil cases falling under Appendix H to the Law Officers' Rules bills for fees and other charges should be submitted to the Remembrancer of Legal Affairs for countersignature with the authority for appearance in the case.
6. In references under the Land Acquisition Act Pleader's fee should be calculated as laid down in rule 44 (3) of the Law Officers' Rules and bills for fees and other charges should be submitted to the Remembrancer of Legal Affairs for countersignature (Appendix G to the Law Officers' Rules).
7. The number and date of the Gazette notification and the purpose for which the land was acquired not stated (*vide* Appendix G to the Law Officers' Rules).
8. Bills in Land Acquisition cases or in Election cases are not debited to the Remembrancer of Legal Affairs' grants under "24, Administration of Justice".

9. In applications for recovery of Pauper costs Pleader's fee should be calculated at 12 annas per cent. on the amount to be recovered.

10. Want of authority in original directing him to appear and oppose the Pauper application [*vide* rule 44 (3A) read with rule 148 of the Law Officers' Rules].

11. Please state whether Government costs in the case were awarded and recovered from the Plaintiffs.

12. Want of a copy of the Court's order or decree containing memorandum of costs.

13. Want of vouchers in support of the item of Rs. in the bill.

14. Want of an authority from the District Magistrate in original for appearance in the case.

15. Want of a certificate from the Magistrate or the Sessions Judge that the number of days charged for is correct.

16. Bill should be prepared on printed forms in English as prescribed in the General Letter No. 24-D.A.III-24-3/509, dated the 22nd May 1928, from the Accountant General, Bombay.

17. Want of English translations of the vernacular vouchers.

18. Purpose of journey not stated.

19. Hours of journey not shown.

20. The times when the case was to commence and when it ended on each day of hearing not stated in the certificates of attendance (Appendix EE to the Law Officers' Rules).

21. Delay in the submission of claim not explained.

22. The nature of Government interest in the case not stated.

23. Want of identity between the case as entered in the bill and as mentioned in the authority relating thereto.

24. Double fee for the is inadmissible.

25. Travelling allowance of journey within 5 miles of headquarters not admissible.

26. Daily allowance for more than 10 days of a halt at one place not admissible.

27. Classification not stated in the bill.

28. Authority for claiming fee more than the fee awarded by the Court not stated.

29. Stationery including paper not admissible (*vide* Government Circular, Legal Department, No. 6497, dated 4th December 1934).

30. Want of sub-voucher in support of the road mileage as required by note 1 under rule 414 of the B. C. S. R. Manual.

31. The attention of the District Government Pleader, Belgaum, is invited to the provisions of rule 21(4) of the Law Officers (Conditions of Service) Rules and he is requested to prefer his bill for fees accordingly.

32. It has been noticed that the D. G. P., has been countersigning the bills himself as in the present case. He should not do so in future.

No.L.A.Q.Suit 3/44.
Belgaum,25th October 1945.

To

The Remembrancer of Legal Affairs,Bombay.

Sir,

With reference to your No.6744 dated the 14th ultimo, I have the honour to remove the objections as under:-

Obj.No.31:-The Bill of fees in this case has been preferred according to the Bill of Costs awarded by the Court, (Please vide Rule 21(4)(b) of the L.O.Rs. Hence,it is correct.

Obj.No.32:-The bill was countersigned through oversight. Hence,an another one was prepared and sent to you for favour of countersigning, on 12.9.1945(Vide this office No.L.A.Q.Suits of 1945.)The accompaniments have now been sent.

Your obedient servant,

For Dist.Govt.Pleader,Bgm.

THE SECRETARY ...

9474
27-10-45/C

14 . S. & C. Legal Department
9474/27.10.45

Submitted with pps.

2. Please see orders passed on D.N. at pages 9-10 ante. Accordingly the Bills were returned to the D.G.P. Belgaum with objn. no. 31 for compliance. vide 'A' overleaf — ✓ p 12 ante

3. The D.G.P. states in reply that the case falls under rule 21(4)(b) of the L.O. (C.O.S.) Rs. Hence the bill for fees is correct.

4. The case clearly falls under sub-rule (a) of rule 21(4) of the L.O. (C.O.S.) Rules & not under sub-rule (b) as stated by the D.G.P. A

5. The bills may be returned to the D.G.P. Belgaum as per memo. pnp upon for approval

Submd 14/11/45

Submd 15/11 A.G. I should like to know what is the basis of fee charged as above according to soldiers as ab

✓ p. 15 I like to know what is the basis of fee charged as above according to soldiers as ab

15/11/45

Submitted with reference to A. Ss. query at p. 14 ante.

The D. G. P. Belgaum was asked vide objn. no. 31 at p. 4 ante to state the amount of compensation awarded by the Collector and the amount of compensation claimed in the reference to the Court. The D. G. P. replied vide his letter at pages 7-8 ante that "the Collector awarded Rs. 1682-8 plus Rs. 292-8 in the shape of mesne profits. Applicants claimed in all Rs. 4881/- and deducting therefrom the amount already rec'd. they claim Rs. 3198/-." Thus the amount awarded by the Coll. comes to Rs. 1975 (1682-8 + 292-8) and the amount of compensation claimed in the ref. to the Court is Rs. 3198/-. (Under the provisions of rule 21(4)(a) of the L.A.C.(W.) Rs. The D.G.P. wd. be entitled to his fees on the difference of Rs. 1223/- (3198-1975). The fees wd therefore come to Rs. 61-4 as shown in the margin.)

100 : 225 :: 5

$\frac{225 \times 5}{100} = \frac{245}{4} = 61\frac{1}{4}$

$\frac{225 \times 5}{100} = 61.4$

Submitted 20/11/45

Submitted. 21/11

A.S.S. 21/11/45

No. 8813

Office of the
Remembrancer of Legal Affairs,
Bombay Castle, 23rd November 1945.

MEMORANDUM.

The bills, with accompaniments, for Rs. 135 - 15 and Rs. 38-15 for fees and law charges in Land Acquisition suit No. 3 of 1944 are returned herewith to the District Government Pleader, Belgaum.

2. The present case clearly falls under sub-rule (a) of rule 21(4) of the Law Officers (conditions of service) Rules, 1939 and not under sub-rule (b) as stated by the District Government Pleader, in his letter No. L.A.Q. suit 3/44, dated the 25th October 1945.

3. He should, therefore, prefer a bill for Rs. 61-4-0 for fees calculated on the difference between the amount of compensation awarded by the Collector and the amount of compensation claimed in the reference to the Court

P.T.O.

which comes to Rs. 3198-Rs1975) Rs. 1223.

oc

for Remembrancer of Legal Affairs.

To

The District Government Pleader,
Belgaum.

BM Submitting for signature

Sd/-
23/11/45

Issued
Sd/-23/11

Supdt. 23/11

A.S pr
23/11

No.L.A.Q.3/44.
Belgaum, 10th Novr.1945.

To

The Remembrancer of Legal Affairs,

Bombay.



Subject:- Land Acquisition Suit No. 3 of 1944.
Acquisition for Dhupadal Storage.

Sir,

With reference to the above subject and your No. 8813 dated the 23rd November 1945, I have the honour to state as under:-

The Collector in this case, awarded Rs.1975/- to the applicant. As the Plff. found that amount inadequate, he requested to refer the matter to the District Court. In his application, he has expressly prayed for a claim of Rs.3198/- after deducting the amount already received by him, awarded by the Collector. On the whole, the claim in this matter would, therefore come to Rs.3198/- + Rs.1975/- =Rs.5173/-.

2. The difference, on which the pleader's fees are to be calculated under sub-rule (a) of Rule 21(4) of the

Law Officers' Rules, comes to Rs. 3198/-. Hence, fees on that amount of Rs.3198/- comes to Rs. 135-15-0. (On Rs. 2000/- at ~~Rx~~ 5 % and on the remaining amount of Rs.1198/- at 3 %) The bill preferred may, therefore, be kindly countersigned and sent. The bills are sent herewith.

Your obedient servant,

V. M. [illegible]

District Govt.Pleader,Belgaum.

17 Legal Department
10.976/12.12.1945.

Submitted with pp.

2. Please see this Office memo. no. 8813 of 23rd November 1945. In reply the D.G.P., Belgaum States that the applicant in his application has expressly prayed for a claim of Rs. 3198/- after deducting the amount already received by him. On the whole, he states that the claim would come to (3198+1975) Rs. 5173. After deducting the amount of Rs. 1975/- awarded by the Collector, he states, he would be entitled to his fees on the balance of (5173-1975) Rs. 3198

3. Please see the wording of rule 21(4)(a) of the LO(COS) Rs. The words are " ..... and the amount of compensation claimed in the reference to the Court." In the present case the amount of compensation claimed in the reference to the Court is Rs. 3198/- and it appears that the amount of Rs 1975/- awarded by the Collector

cannot be added to it in order to determine the claim.

For orders.

Reqd. 12/1/46

The interpretation put by the D.S.P. does not appear to be correct in view of the wording of rule 21(4)(a) of the C.D (Conds of S) Rules. It also

Supt. see portions as underlined in the decree p. 23 ante

12/1

A.S. I agree. The D.S.P's interpretation is not in accordance.

RK 12/1/46

ACR D.S.P's claim appears to be valid. The plff claimed Rs 3198 after deducting the amount awarded by the Court. Pl reconsider.

R.K. 18/1

C.

Submitted.

On reconsideration it is submitted that the interpretation of the D.G.P., Belgaum appears to be correct.

19/1/46

Supdt. 21/1

A.S. With respect, I submit the D.G.P's interpretation does not appear to be correct. The language used in Rule 21 (4) (a) is very clear and unequivocal. The fees are to be calculated on the difference between the amount awarded by the Collector and the amount claimed in the reference to the Civil Court. The fact that before the Civil Court the claimant reduced his claim seems to be irrelevant for the purpose of Rule 21 (4) (a),

What is important is, what is the amount claimed by the ~~Court~~ claimant ~~in the Court~~ before the Civil Court and what was the amount awarded by the Collector

RK
21/1/46

A.L.R. That does not appear to be the intention. However I don't desire to press my view. The claim as proposed by the Office may be allowed

DK 22/1

21

No. 832

Office of the
Remembrancer of Legal Affairs.
Bombay Castle, 30th January 1946.

Memorandum:

The bills, with accompaniments, for Rs. 135-15-0 and Rs. 38-15-0 for fees and law charges in Land Acquisition Suit No.3 of 1944 are returned herewith to the District Government Pleader, Belgaum.

2. The interpretation of the District Government Pleader, of sub-rule (a) of rule 21(4) of the Law Officers (Conditions of Service) Rules does not appear to be correct. The language used in the rule is clear and unequivocal and the fees are to be calculated on the difference between the amount of compensation awarded by the Collector and the amount of compensation claimed in the reference to the Court.

Issued USP 30/1

3. He is, therefore, requested to prefer a bill according to the instructions contained in para 3 of this office memorandum No.8813, dated the 23rd November 1945.

for signature
30/1/46
30/1
30/1/46

for Remembrancer of Legal Affairs.

To

The District Government Pleader,

Ms. Belgaum.

Submitted after issue of Reply from D. G. P. Belgaum may be awaited.

31/1/46.

Supdt. 31/1

A.S.P. 31/1

23

No.L.A.Q.3/44.
Belgaum,3rd August 1946.

29/11
25

From

B.V.Jakati,Esqr.,LL.B.,
District Government Pleader,Belgaum.

To

The Remembrancer of Legal Affairs,
Bombay.

6881
8-8-46.

Subject:-Land Acquisition Suit No.3/44.
Acquisition for Dhupadal Storage.
Bills of fees & expenses in....

Sir,

With reference to the above subject,and your letter No.832,dated the 30th January 1946,I have the honour to state that the bills of fees and expenses in the above suit,for Rs.135/15/- and Rs.38/15/-were preferred by my predecessor Mr.V.A.Mujumdar.He does not agree with the interpretation of rule 21(4)(a) of the L.O.Rs.made by you and says that the bills are correctly preferred and should be paid accordingly.He is not prepared to prefer fresh bills,as suggested by you in your letter under reference.

2. Thus,under the circumstances, I hope you will please

countersign the bills in question and send them for encashment. Please also vide this office even No. dated the 10th November 1945, on this subject.

Your obedient servant,

District Government Pleader,
Belgaum

25 Legal Department. 6881/8.8.46. 27

Submitted with pp.

2. Please see this Office memorandum no. 832, dated the 31st January 1946. The Ex.D.G.P., Belgaum was requested to prefer a bill according to the instructions contained in para 3 of this Office memo. no. 8813, dt. 23.11.1945. The interpretation of rule 21(4)(a) of the Law Officers (Conditions of Services) Rules was explained to the Ex.D.G.P., Belgaum in para 2 of R.L. No. dt. 27 ante no. 832, dt. 30.1.1946.

3. In reply the D.G.P., Belgaum states that the Ex.D.G.P., Mr Mujumdar, does not agree with our interpretation of rule ~~of~~ 21(4)(a) & says, that the bills prepared by them are correct. The Ex-D.G.P is not however, prepared to prefer fresh bills as suggested in our memo no. 832 dt. 30.1.1946. ~~Hence~~ The

D. S. P. Bulgaon has however forwarded the case of the Ex. D. S. P. for R. L. A's counter signature for orders.

Bom 26/9/46

Supt. 4/10

A.S. The position is explained in the notes at pp 21-24 ante which may be seen. Personally, I feel the L. A's interpretation of Rule 21(4)(a) is correct. If so for orders whether this case should be pressed or the O.A. should be passed

7/10/46

AAC/2 Pl go through the application & consider how the claim is assessed by the applicant.

7/10

Office

27

Submitted with reference to the A.A.L.R's note at p. 32 ante.

2. Please see para 2 of office note at p. 21 ante wherein it has been stated as to how the applicant has assessed the claim.

3. Perhaps these papers may be submitted to the R.L.A. for his decision.

Appr. 2/11/46

supt. 7/11

A.A.L.R. Attention is invited to the notes at pp. 21-24 and 31-32 ante. For orders.

R.L.A. 7/11/46.

R.L.A. L.D. Office interpretation of rule 21(4)(a) is correct. The fees are to be calculated on the differences only. Rees 9/11/46

No. 8072

Office of the
Remembrancer of Legal Affairs,
Bombay Castle, 15th November 1946.

MEMORANDUM.

The bills for Rs. 135-15-0 and Rs.38-15-0, with accompaniments, for fees and law charges preferred by the Ex-District Government Pleader, Belgaum, in Land Acquisition Suit No.3 of 1944 are returned herewith to the District Government Pleader, Belgaum.

2. The attention of the District Government Pleader, Belgaum, is invited to this office Memo.No.832, dated the 30th January 1946 and he is requested to inform the Ex-District Government Pleader, Belgaum to prefer a bill in accordance with the instructions contained in para. 3 of this office memorandum No.8813, dated the 23rd November 1945.

for Remembrancer of Legal Affair

To

Ms.13.11. The District Government Pleader, Belgaum.

Copy to -

V.A. Muzumdar, Esqr., LL.B.,
Ex-District Government Pleader,
Belgaum.

Submitted for approval and signature

31

V. A. Mujumdar,
B. A., LL. B.
Ex.—Dist. Govt. Pleader.
Public Prosecutor.

BELGAUM 33

4th Novr. 1946

Dear Mr. Khan,

I have submitted bills of fees and expenses in connection with L.A.Q.Suit No. 3 of 1944 long ago. It appears that the bills are yet not countersigned owing to some difference in inter-pretation of the Rule in the L.O.Rs. I hope the matter is by now settled and I will feel obliged if the countersigning of the bills is expedited.

Hope to be excused for the troubles,

Yours faithfully,

V. A. Mujumdar

To

A.R.Khan,Esqr.,I.C.S.,
Deputy R.L.A.Bombay.

Will office please explain the position?

A R 12/11

L.D.

Submitted with regrets. The Dy. Secy's note overleaf.

The Ex. D.G.P, Belgaum (Mr. V.A. Mazumdar) has been requested to prepare bill in accordance with instructions contained in R.L. A's memo. no. 8813, dt. 23.11.1945 (PR see R.L. A's memo. no. 8072, dt. 15.11.1946.)

This may be filed with the main file.

Rom 15/11/46

Supt. 15/11

R 16/11

33 Below report from Mr.V.A.Mujumdar,Ex-Dist.Govt. Pleader, Belgaum, to the R.L.A., Bombay.

No.L.A.Q.Suit 3/44.
Belgaum, 29th Novr.1946.

Forwarded with compliments.

Dist.Govt.Pleader,
Belgaum.



35

No.L.A.Q.Suit 3/44.
Belgaum, 29th November 1946.

To

The Remembrancer of Legal Affairs,
Bombay.

Sir,

With reference to your No. 8072 dated 15th November 1946, returning the bills of fees and expenses in Land Acquisition Suit No. 3 of 1944, I have the honour to state that the presumption as regards claim made in the reference to court by the plaintiff, made out by me till now, is correct and that made by your office does not appear to be correct, which will be clear from the copies sent herewith.

2. In the pendency of the suit in court, as it was not made clear in the application by the plaintiff, as regards actual claim by him, I filed a purshis in court and requested to issue a notice to plff. to say as to how much amount he claimed (Vide Exh. 29). To that, he gave a reply by a purshis saying that he claimed Rs.4881/4/- and further says: "Less --

received under protest .. Rs.1682/8/-, Balance due and now claimed. Rs.3198/-". (Exh. 30). The Collector awarded Rs.1682/8/- plus -- Rs.292/8/- in the shape of mesne profits since 1925 at Rs.10/-per acre. About this amount also, plff. had some objections. This has been discussed by the Judge in para 2 of his judgment, a copy of which has already been submitted to you.

3. From what has been stated above, it would be clear that the total claim of the plff. comes to Rs. 1975/- already -- received + Rs.3198/- now claimed as balance, totalling to Rs.5173/ and not only Rs. 3198/- as presumed by your office.

4. Thus, under the circumstances, bills submitted by me, would be found to have been correctly preferred. I have, therefore the honour to request you kindly to countersign the same and send them at a very early date. The bills accompany together with accompaniments.

Your obedient servant,

H. D. Limaye

Ex-Dist.Govt.Pleader, Belgaum.

Forwarded with compliments through the Dist.Govt.Pleader, Belgaum.

37 Legal Department.
10896/2-12-1946.

Submitted with pp. (p. 33 ante)

2. As per orders of the R.L.A. Mr. Mujumdar, Ex-Dist. Govt. Pleader, Belgaum was informed (p. 35 ante) that he should prefer a bill in accordance with the instructions contained in para 3 of R.L.A's Memo. No. 8813, dated the 23rd November 1945. (p. 17 ante)

3. Mr. Mujumdar, Ex-Dist. Govt. Pleader, Belgaum now practically repeats the same old facts and states that the R.L.A's interpretation of rule 21(4)(a) of the L.O.(C. of S.) Rules is not correct and that the bills are correctly preferred by him and may be returned countersigned.

4. For orders.

Supt 4/12

S.A.S. S.A.S. The R.L.A has already decided (p. 33 ante) vide L.D. interpretation of rule 21(4)(a) is correct. I do not see how it is open to Mr. Mujumdar to question the R.L.A's ruling. I think we should

RAN defendants inform him that Government does not accept his interpretation of the rule in question and that he should prefer his will as directed in this office Memo No. 832 of 30th January 1946. (P.27 ante) otherwise he will not be passed.

RB
4/12/46

ALR RK 4/12

No. 8905 / 39/45 41

Office of the
Remembrancer of Legal Affairs,
Bombay Castle, 10th December 1946.

Subject:- Bills for fees and law charges in L.A.Q.Suit No.3 of 1944.

MEMORANDUM.

With reference to his letter No.L.A.Q.Suit No.3/44, dated the 29th November 1946, on the above subject, the Ex-District Government Pleader, Belgaum, is informed that this office interpretation of rule 21(4)(a) of the Law Officers (Conditions of Service) Rules has already been explained to him in this office memorandum No.832, dated the 30th January 1946, and he is now definitely informed that Government does not accept his interpretation of the rule in question and that he should prefer a bill as directed in para. 3 of this office memorandum No.8813, dated the 23rd November 1945.

2. The bills, with accompaniments, received with his letter referred to above are returned herewith.

for Remembrancer of Legal Affairs.

To

V.A.Mujumdar, Esq., LL.B.,
Ex-District Government Pleader, Belgaum.
(Through - The District Government Pleader, Belgaum).

Ms.7.12.

41 93 39

To be substituted for R.L.A's Office Memorandum No.8905, dated the 10th December 1946, which has been sent unsigned through over-sight.

No. 8937

Office of the
Remembrancer of Legal Affairs,
Bombay Castle, 11th December 1946.

Subject:- Bills for fees and law charges in L.A.Q.Suit No. 3 of 1944.

MEMORANDUM.

With reference to his letter No.LAQ.Suit No.3/44, dated the 29th November 1946, on the above subject, the attention of the Ex-District Government Pleader, Belgaum, is invited to this Office Memorandum No. 832, dated the 30th January 1946 and he is informed that Government does not accept his interpretation of rule 21(4)(a) of the Law Officers (Conditions of Service) Rules. He is therefore requested to prefer a bill as directed in para. 3 of this Office Memorandum No.8813, dated the 23rd November 1945.

2. The bills, with accompaniments, received with his letter referred to above are returned herewith.

oc

for Remembrancer of Legal Affairs.

To

V.A. Mujumdar, Esq., LL.B.,
Ex-District Government Pleader, Belgaum.

Subd. for signature
11/12
Suff.

Ms.11.12.

(Through - The District Government Pleader, Belgaum).

43 61 15 05

57

From

V.A.Mujumdar,Esquire,LL.B.,
Ex-Dist.Govt.Pleader,Belgaum.

To

The Remembrancer of Legal Affairs,
Bombay.

Subject:- Bills for fees and law charges in LAQ.Suit No. 3 of 1944.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. 8905 dated the 10th instant, on the above subject, I have the honour to send herewith a new bill of fees as directed in para 3 of your memorandum No. 8813, dated the 23rd November 1946. The bill of expenses also is sent herewith together with the necessary papers. I have, therefore, the honour to request you to be good enough to counter-sign the bills and send the same for encashment, at a very early date.

Your obedient servant,

V. A. Mujumdar

Ex-Dist.Govt.Pleader,Belgaum.

Belgaum,
13.12.1946.

F.W.Cs. through the Dist.Govt.Pleader,Belgaum.

No.L.A.Q.Suit 3/44.
Belgaum,. 14th December 1946.

Forwarded with compliments to the Remembrancer of Legal Affairs, Bombay, for further necessary action.

for

District Government Pleader,
Belgaum.



45 - Legal Department
11426/16.12.1946.

Submitted with pp.

2. Please see this Office Memorandum No. 8937, dt. 11.12.1946. At last the Ex. A.G.P. Belgaum has prepared two bills for Rs. 61-4-0 and Rs. 38-15-0 for fees and law charges in L.A.R. Suit No. 3 of 1944, as directed in the Office memorandum No. 8813, dt. 23.11.1945. The land was acquired under G.N. R.D. No. 8429/33, dt. 26.12.1938 published at pages 9-12 of B.G.G., Pt I, 1939.

Exhibit O of B.G.G. Pt I of 1939

3. The bills are in order and may be returned to the Ex. A.G.P., Belgaum, duly countersigned. However, the bills are returned, the R.D. may be requested also to point out the source from which the charges billed for should be met.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT
(28)
Fdg No.
DEC 1946

19/12

19/12/46

Work R.D. No. 9257 dt. 19.12.

Rev. Deptt

Returned to the H.O., through the D.O., with the intimation that the source from which the charges billed for should be met is, "7-H.R".

A

SAS.

H.O.R. to D.O. dt 21/1/47.

L. D. 28 JAN 1947

to L(1).

to L(1)

47

No. 1398

Legal Department,
Bombay Castle, 11th February 1947.

Subject:- Law Charges.

Payment of -
to the Ex-District Government Pleader, Belgaum, in L.A.Q. Suit No. 3 of 1944 on the file of the District Judge, Belgaum.

. . . . . .

MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying two bills amounting to Rs. 100-3-0 (Rupees one hundred and annas three only) are returned herewith to the Ex-District Government Pleader, Belgaum, duly countersigned.

2. The law charges in question should be met from the current year's provision under the head "7-Land Revenue".

By order of the Governor of Bombay,

Assistant Secretary to the Government of Bombay, Legal Department.

To

V.A. Mujumdar, Esqr., LL.B.,
Ex-District Government Pleader, Belgaum,
(through the District Government Pleader
Belgaum).

Ms.S.2.

Copy to -

The Revenue Department,
The Finance Department,
The Accountant General, Bombay,
The Treasury Officer, Belgaum.

Legal Deptt.
1111/29.1.47
Submitted.
2. Pl see R.D.& F.D. notes at p. 68 ante.
3. The above memo. put up for approval & signature may kindly be done.
4. S.A.S. will kindly countersign the bills at slips 4 and 5.
8/2/47
Supt.
S.A.S.